

REMARKS

It is noted that claims 1-20 and 22-25 are pending in the application, that claims 8, 9, 22 and 23 stand allowed, that claims 3 and 5 have been objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and that claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10-20, 24 and 25 stand rejected as discussed more fully below.

Claim 3 has been rewritten in independent form and, along with dependent claim 5, is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12-19, 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) on U.S. Patent No. 4,155,967 to South et al. in view of U.S. 1,861,069 to Smith. Independent claims 1, 14, 24 and 15 have been amended to call for features of applicant's claimed monolithic dome-shaped building that are believed to have resulted in allowance of the independent claim 8 and claim 3 when rewritten in independent form. For example, claim 1 has been amended to call for the door as being supported at an upper end on the building by a substantially horizontal arcuate track to enable lateral sliding movement generally in the plane of the door such that the door compliments the dome shaped peripheral wall when in its first (closed) position and is disposed closely adjacent the peripheral wall of the dome shaped building when in its second (open) position.

The cited Smith patent, on the other hand, has its lower peripheral extent defined by alternate doorways which are provided with inner and outer sliding doors 7 and 8 with each pair of doors 7 and 8 being offset radially so that they may be moved into overlapping relation. In this respect, the doors in Smith define the peripheral wall of the Smith hangar. The Smith reference does not teach or suggest making the doors 7 and 8 to include a rigid frame structure

supporting an outer metallic sheet or a mesh reinforced buildup layer of cementitious material defining a generally unitary closure wall having a three-dimensional convex external contour substantially similar to an outer convex contour of a dome shaped building adjacent an access opening. Moreover, the Smith doors 7, 8 are not moved from first closed positions complementing a dome shaped peripheral wall of the hangar to second positions closely adjacent the peripheral wall of the hangar. It is respectfully submitted that the Smith reference does not teach or suggest modification of the cited South reference in a manner that would result in a monolithic dome shaped building as defined in applicant's amended claim1.

Similarly, claim 14 has been amended to call for the door closure as comprising a rigid unitary door of substantially similar uniform thickness to the peripheral wall of the dome shaped building and having an upper margin supported on a substantially horizontal guide track for lateral movement in substantially its own plane between first and second positions, the door including a rigid frame structure supporting a mesh reinforced built-up layer of cementitious material having a three-dimensional exterior contour substantially similar to the convexly contoured peripheral external wall of the dome-shaped building laterally adjacent the access opening so that the door complements the dome shaped building when in its first closed position and is disposed adjacent an interior surface of the peripheral wall of the dome shaped building when in its second position.

Independent claims 24 and 25 have been similarly amended so that amended claims 1, 14, 24 and 25 include structural features called for in allowed independent claim 8 and claim 3 that is now been rewritten in independent form and is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 11 and 20 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) on the South et al. '967 reference as modified by the cited Smith '069 patent, and further in view of U.S. Patent No.

3,736,707 to Neufeld, as set forth on page 5 of the Action. Claim 11 depends indirectly from amended claim 1, and claim 20 depends indirectly from amended claim 14. As aforesaid, amended claims 1 and 20 are believed to be in condition for allowance, wherefor dependent claims 11 and 20 are also believed to be allowable.


Accordingly, amended claims 1, 14, 24 and 25, along with their respective dependent claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 9 10-13 and 15-20 are believed to be in condition for allowance along with previously allowed claims 8, 9, 22 and 23 and "allowable" claims 3 and 5.

In view of the foregoing, applicant's claims 1-20 and 22-25 as now presented are believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. Because amended independent claims 1, 14, 23 and 25 incorporate structural features from allowed claims, it is believed that further searching and undue consideration should not be necessary

If the Examiner should determine that a telephone discussion with applicant's undersigned attorney would be beneficial to moving the application to allowance, it is respectfully requested that she initiate such a discussion.

Respectfully submitted,

WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

By 

Richard L. Wood
Registration No. 22,839

Dated: March 29, 2005
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza - 22nd Floor
Chicago, IL 60606
Phone: (312) 655-1500
Fax: (312) 655-1501